

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

- Claims 1-10 and 20-27 are pending in the Application after entry of this amendment.
- Claims 1, 5, 6, and 20 are amended.

Examiner Interview

Applicant's representative thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview held on December 6, 2006. During that interview, Applicant's representative discussed the Figure 3A tree structure, the at least three nodes within the tree structure, and the business directory listings being the lowest level of the at least three levels among other aspects of the invention. The mapping of the leaf level nodes to only the business directory nodes was also discussed with respect to the tree structure of Figure 3A. That tree structure was then compared against the element (a) of Claim 1 and the various elements were identified. In a discussion of the cited art, it was agreed that Yacoby is absent a tree structure, absent three levels of nodes, and does not have the business directory listings at a lowest level within the at least three levels. It was also clarified that Claim 1 represents a "registration" system and not a "searching" system. The parties agreed that Claim 1 substantially represents the disclosure and that Claim 1 is distinct from the cited art of Yacoby. However, to further clarify, it is desirable to add an explicit statement into Claim 1 that the business directory listings are the lowest level of nodes in the at least three levels of nodes and that overall, a client selection of the business category for registration should be indicated in the claims.

Claim Amendments

Applicant amends independent Claims 1, 5, 6, and 20 to include the elements of the business directory level being the lowest node level within the at least three levels of nodes and that the registration process uses a client selection of the business category. Applicant believes this complies with the interview discussion held with the Examiner. Applicant finds support for these amendments in the structure of the tree disclosed in Figure 3A. The client

input when registering is disclosed throughout the specification but may be seen in the as-filed specification on pages 21 line 26- page 22 line 1 where the speciation states:

“If the user wants to create a new listing, processing proceeds to block 742 where the user is prompted to select the appropriate categories and SICs.” (page 21 line 26 – page 22 line 1).

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-10 and 20-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner states that the element “the business directory listings are child nodes of the leaf nodes and the business category nodes are parent nodes of the leaf nodes” is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Also, the specification does not describe how the leaf node level maps only to the business directory listing.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Concerning the parent and child relationship between the at least three levels of nodes, this was discussed and agreed to during the Examiner Interview of 12/6/2006 as being in the as-filed specification. Also, please reference the April 20, 2006 response from Applicant referring to Figure 3A and pages 15 and 16 of the as-filed application. Concerning the aspect that the leaf nodes level maps only to the business directory listing level, that too was discussed and agreed to be in the as-filed specification during the Examiner interview held on 12/6/2006 with regard to the node interconnections and parent and child relationships shown in Figure 3A. It was also pointed out that this is a “registration system” and not a “searching mechanism”.

Thus, Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C §112 rejection based on the agreeable interview with the Examiner and the as-filed specification citations above.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103 (a)

Claims 1-10 and 20-27 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,516,311 to Yacoby et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0166/144193.01
Application No.: 09/650,605
Office Action Dated: September 27, 2006

PATENT

As indicated above in the Examiner Interview dated 12/6/2006, Yacoby was discussed and it was agreed that Yacoby fails to disclose a tree structure having at least three levels of nodes used in a registration system for business directory listings where the listings are the lowest level of node in the three level tree structure and where the client selects the category for the business level listing registration.

Applicant amends independent Claims 1, 5, 6, and 20 to more clearly define the invention and as such, it becomes clearer that the pending claims patentably define over the cited art.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and reconsideration of Claims 1-10 and 20-27.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the arguments and amendments effectively traverse the rejections of the cited art. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration for all pending claims and a Notice of Allowance.

Note to Examiner

Applicant would like to indicate that a divisional application of the present application is also currently pending before the Examiner. It is case 10/832,656.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 27, 2006

/Jerome G. Schaefer/
Jerome G. Schaefer
Registration No. 50,800

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439